REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 15, 17-22, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected. Claims 7, 8, 11-16, 23, 24, 26 and 29-31 have been indicated as allowable. Claims 22-24, 26, and 31 have been cancelled. New claims 32 and 33 have been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 26 was objected to because of a lack of antecedent basis for "the non-selected power amplifiers." Claim 26 has been cancelled and its subject matter has been incorporated into claim 19. Claim 19 does not contain these informalities.

II. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C.§112, Second Paragraph

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 22 has been cancelled.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 17-21, 25, 27 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 17-21, 25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Robinson, et al. (U.S. 6,853,244) (hereinafter "Robinson"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a correction path that is operative to provide at least a substantial portion of the amplified output signal when the system is in a third mode. Robinson does not disclose a correction path that is operative to provide at least a substantial portion of the amplified output signal when the system is in a third mode,

as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Robinson. does not teach each and every element of claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1 and claims 2-18, which depend therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2-6, 9-10 and 17-18 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate matter from claim 26 that has been deemed allowable. Accordingly, claims 19, as well as dependent claims 20-21, 25, and 27, should be in condition for allowance and withdrawal of the rejection of is respectfully requested.

Claim 28, as amended, recites a method of amplifying an input signal. The method includes selecting between a first mode of operation, associated with a first polar amplifier, and a second mode of operation associated with a second polar amplifier. The second mode of operation is selected when the amplitude of the input signal falls within an amplitude range that includes a distortion range associated with the second polar amplifier. The input signal is amplified *via* the first polar amplifier in the first mode of operation and amplified *via* the second polar amplifier in the second mode of operation while continuously switching between the plurality of modes of operation to provide an amplified output signal.

The Robinson patent discloses a system in which a linear amplifier is used in combination with a polar amplifier to amplify an input signal. The polar amplifier is used to amplify signals at larger amplitudes, while the linear amplifier is used to amplify signals within a distortion region (*e.g.*, near a zero crossing point) of the polar amplifier. The linear amplifier is less efficient than the polar amplifier, but provides a more accurate output signal when the signal is close to the zero crossing point.

The claims of the present application attempts to improve on the efficiency of the Robinson patent by replacing the linear amplifier with yet another polar amplifier. Accordingly, a second polar amplifier can be selected even when the signal is within its associated distortion range, as recited in claim 28. Claim 28 defines over Robinson because polar amplification is being performed at a range of amplitudes in which the

amplifier is in distortion, a range that includes the zero crossing point of the input signal. Robinson teaches the use of linear amplification near the zero crossing point to avoid operating a polar amplifier within its distortion ranges. Therefore, Robinson does not disclose each and every element of claim 28, and therefore does not anticipate claim 28. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 is allowable over the cited art.

Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 28. Claims 29 and 30 have been indicated as containing allowable matter. Claim 30 has been amended to remain consistent with its base claim, claim 28, but it is believed that the matter deemed allowable in claim 30 has been retained. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 28-30 are in condition for allowance.

For the reasons described above, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 17-21, 25, 27 and 28 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. New Claims 32-33

Claim 32 incorporates the elements of claim 19 and claim 23. Claim 23, which depended directly from claim 19, was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form with all of the elements of the base claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is in condition for allowance. New claim 33 contains the same subject matter as previous claim 24. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 32 and 33 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5/5/05

Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER NO.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SUITE 1111
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-1400
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072